

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-16, 18-19, 21-24, and 25-31 (the latter set renumbered as 33-39, respectively, as suggested in the Office Action) remain pending. No claims have been added or canceled.

It is submitted that the claim amendments are supported in the specification as filed, for instance at pages 6-7 and 9. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Turning now to the claim rejections, all claims stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5, 892,856 to Cooper et al (Cooper). Although Applicants reserve the right to swear behind Cooper, the claims have been amended here to clarify some distinctions with respect to Cooper.

Beginning with claim 15, this claim as amended refers to a computer system having a memory and a processor that causes the system to transition from an active mode to a sleep mode, in response to a predetermined period of computer inactivity. The system also has a video interface that is to store a property of one or more frames that represent a video camera's view at different times. The video interface is to compare the property of two frames from the video camera to each other, while the system is in the sleep mode. The video interface is to cause the system to exit the sleep mode in response to the comparison. Cooper does not disclose nor does it make obvious such a system.

In Cooper, a method of presence detection using video input is described for detecting whether a user is in close proximity to an end point. This allows multiple individuals that typically work together as a team to communicate with each other out of their offices for meetings, using a network link. Cooper, column 1, lines 20-45 and column 2, lines 24-28. The so-called GroupLink application allows two or more end point systems to interact with each other (over a computer network) based on proximity

information of its users. For instance, a simple “in” or “out” indication identifies whether the user is IN or OUT of his office, which will be communicated to another user of the GroupLink application. The GroupLink application includes a packet manager, keyboard sensor, cursor control sensor, video capture device, and a presence detector 325. The presence detector determines that the user is IN when a number of cameras provide a difference measurement that is greater than a threshold. The presence detector 325 may be coupled to the user’s compact disc player for automatically turning off and on the CD player when the user is OUT or IN, respectively. It can also be used to automatically control the lights in the user’s office and to automatically log the user in and out from a computer network, or to notify a homeowner at his office when his garage door at home has been opened.

It is important to note, however, that in all of the above situations, the presence detector 325 requires that the user’s computer system be active, that is not in a sleep mode. It is well known, of course, that the sleep mode is a very low power state of operation for a computer system that essentially powers down almost all the functions of the computer system, based on the absence of interaction with the system by the user. Accordingly, Cooper does not teach or suggest *a video interface that is to store a property of one or more frames representing a video camera’s view at different times and to compare the property of two frames from the video camera to each other while the computer system is in the sleep mode, and to cause the computer system to exit the sleep mode in response to the comparison*. Operation of the presence detector in Cooper appears to require that the system **not** be in the sleep mode. Therefore, Cooper does not anticipate nor does it render obvious Applicants’ claim 15.

Turning now to claim 22, this claim is directed to a method in which a computer system is to transition from an active mode to a sleep mode in response to a period of computer inactivity. Frames that correspond to a view at different times, while in the sleep mode, are received. A property is determined for the frames, and the computer system is caused to exit the sleep mode if the property differs between the frames by a

predetermined amount. This is not taught or suggested by Cooper. In Cooper, the user is IN or OUT for purposes of a network link application that is running on the user's computer system. Cooper does not teach or suggest *receiving frames corresponding to a view at different times while the computer system is in the sleep mode and causing the computer system to exit the sleep mode if a determined property is different for the two frames by a predetermined amount*. Therefore, claim 22 is not anticipated or obvious in view of Cooper.

Turning now to claim 33, this claim recites a system comprising a computer and a video camera that is coupled to the computer to detect motion. A processor of the video camera is to compare two frames stored in the memory of the video camera to each other while the computer is in a sleep mode, to determine whether there is motion proximate to the computer. The computer is then caused to exit the sleep mode, in response to the detected motion proximate to the computer. In Cooper, however, the presence detector which determines whether the user is IN or OUT does so as part of a network link application that is running on the user's computer system, while the system is most likely in its **active mode** of operation. This does not teach or suggest the interaction between the video camera and the computer of Applicants' claim 33.

Finally, claim 37 is directed to a method in which multiple frames are received from a video camera that is coupled to a computer, where the frames correspond to a view that is proximate to the computer at different times, while the computer is in the sleep mode. A determination is made as to whether there is motion proximate to the computer while the computer is in the sleep mode, based on differences between the frames. The computer is then caused to exit the sleep mode in response to motion detected proximate to the computer. Although the presence detector in Cooper processes frames of an end point, this is done in the context of a network link application in order to indicate whether a user is IN or OUT of her office. This does not teach or suggest the operations recited in Applicants' claim 37 which occur while the computer is in the sleep mode.

Any dependent claims not mentioned above are submitted as not being anticipated or obvious, for at least the same reasons given above in support of their base claims.

It should be noted that not all of the assertions made in the Office Action, particularly those with respect to the dependent claims, have been addressed here, in the interest of conciseness. Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the assertions made in the Office Action by the Examiner, with respect to the relied upon art references and how they would relate to Applicants' claim language.

### CONCLUSION

In sum, a good faith attempt has been made to explain the invention recited in Applicants' claim is different from and patentable in view of the relied upon art references. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: May 9, 2006

By   
Farzad E. Amiri, Reg. No. 42,261

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on May 9, 2006.

  
Suzanne Johnston

May 9, 2006